DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 985 CS 010 035

AUTHOR Sebesta, Sam
TITLE Literacy for Batman's Child
PUB DATE 9 May 90
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association (35th, Atlanta, GA, May 6-11, 1990).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Basal Reading; Beginning Reading; Childhood Interests; *Childrens Literature; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Education; Functional Reading; Language Experience Approach; Reading Comprehension; Reading Research; *Reading Skills; Reading Strategies; Reading Teachers; *Teacher Role; Whole Language Approach
IDENTIFIERS Educational Issues; Emergent Literacy; Reading Concepts

ABSTRACT

The wealth of information gleaned from reading research both past and present needs to be applied to a practical eclectic reading methodology. First, an emergent instruction model needs to be created that takes into account the immediate interests and needs of the learner. This model should recognize that learning is a transaction, with the learner sharing in the transaction in a way that direct instruction does not. Second, the eclectic approach of the future must respect the centrality of the teacher. It cannot prescribe or script what they are to do and say. Despite the differences in approaches, many effective instructors teach in balanced, individualistic ways and represent the central figure in a child's education--the constant, stable adult on whom learning depends. Third, educators need to re-think children's interests. The possibilities for using realia and technology to initiate, not just reflect, interests in school are enormous, not to be confined to what a child has seen on TV or in the neighborhood. Fourth, aesthetic response to literature reading instruction needs to be considered, otherwise reading instruction will produce a condition called aliteracy: an aliterate is a person who can read but who does not choose to do so. Finally, more attention needs to be devoted to the questions of what is functional reading for a child and how educators can increase what a child does with functional reading. (Six quotes are included.) (KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED317985

Last August I got a letter from President Johnson--I am referring to President Dale Johnson, not Lyndon--asking me to be on the Leaders in Reading series. I was astonished. I showed it to my Dean and he was even more astonished. During my 27 years at the University of Washington, I haven't even been the leader in the annual bomb drill. When it comes to committee work, I'm the paper monitor.

However, my Dean is very kind. He gave me a course on being a leader so that I might stand before you today to fulfill President Johnson's request. My Dean said that a leader always covers his tracks and other parts of his anatomy. He pointed out that the lead dog in the Husky dogsled team is the only dog that gets a change of scenery. He said that true leadership is the ability to get the herd headed approximately West.

This inspiring lecture from my dean gave me so much confidence that I plunged immediately into my basement. There for the past 27 years I have kept the piles of boxes which I call my reading files. The boxes are all labeled: word recognition, comprehension, attitudes, reading readiness, study skills, literature, basal readers, and so forth. But over the years the boxes have got mixed up. They have shifted around by themselves, trying to get a better look at each other. I didn't know what to do, so I went back and asked my Dean what to do, and he said what Deans always say under such circumstances: "Call in a consultant."

So I did. I called in one whole research center and put them up in a fancy hotel and fed them salmon. They advised me to sort my boxes more carefully--into little boxes with more specific skills and strategies: consonants, vowels, syllables, phonemic segmentation phonograms, anaphors, semaphores, metaphors, text-explicit, text-implicit, SQ3R, DRTA, CTA KWL, VSS, word maps, graphic organizers, semantic features, contextual redefinitions, GRP, PIRL, DIA, ReQuest, InQuest, and I don't know what all. They said, sort and assemble hierarchically and by the end of this century or next you'll have equipage requisite for Leadership in Reading. I thanked them and sent them home. I sent Dale Johnson the bill for their services. Then I called in another consultant. Ken somebody.

CS010035

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
SAM L. SEBESTA
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Ken's advice was the opposite. He said, "Stir your boxes more often. Mix them. Let in light and air. Water them and give them fertilizer. Let the labels drift. If you must call your files something, just call them READING, or better yet READING AND WRITING, or best of all call them WHOLE LANGUAGE."

I was greatly relieved by Ken's words. I thanked him and sent him home. I went to the office and gave my Dean the bill for Ken's services. Then I went home, but I didn't return to the basement. I sat down to think.

I decided that the most important book about reading instruction for teachers and researchers today is AMERICAN READING INSTRUCTION by Nila Banton Smith, preferably the * 1934 edition. (OVERHEAD #1) It is a history; its paradoxical task is to show that, from the beginning until now, reading instruction has been both cyclical and evolutionary. That is, we tend to repeat ourselves but we get better at doing it. Nila Banton Smith wrote the book with the conviction that if we're aware of history, we're more likely to improve upon it. Now, 56 years later, I see no reason to doubt her judgment.

To the Greeks and Romans, learning to read meant learning their alphabet frontwards, backwards, and inside out. Simultaneously, it meant memorizing hunks of whatever was thought to contain wisdom--odes and epics, including the thrilling stories from the ODYSSEY. Memory was matched to script until--eureka!--you could read.

In Shakespeare's time, Hornbooks and Bibles written in English were beginning to be common. Memory was still the main device. And still there's that emphasis on the alphabet. Now, too, comes some thought of motivation. For instance, a Dutchman named Basedow asked for a government grant to hire a baker for each school to bake the letters out of gingerbread--

> To Master John the English maid
> A Hornbook gives of gingerbread,
> And that the child may learn the better,
> As he can name, he eats the letter,
> Proceeding thus with vast delight
> He gnaws and spells from left to right.

Perhaps that's why paintings of that time show plump children and why literacy rates were relatively low.

It went on like that: extreme attention to the alphabet and the syllabarium (the ba, be, bi, bo, bu syndrome) accompanied by memorization to be matched to text. In modern terms, the method was a combination of synthetics and analytics--synthetic focus on alphabet and pieces of syllables; analytic attention to the whole discourse. For centuries, no one argued for one side or the other. There was no Jeanne Chall to argue for synthetics. There was no Kenneth Goodman to argue for analytics.

Then, in the early 1800s, the great debate got started. Should reading be taught in little pieces or in whole chunks? Or did it matter? It mattered to Josiah Bumstead, who wrote QUOTE ONE on your handout. It implies more than letters versus the word, by the way. It hints at a philosophical difference which Mr. Bumstead contends is between vexation and pleasure. Over time, that philosophical difference was to grow.

Enter the McGuffeys. The first set of McGuffey readers appeared in 1837. They were the first graded readers--one book per year from grades 1 to 8. And their full
** title is not McGuffey's Readers but McGuffey's Eclectic Readers. (OVERHEAD #2) You see, the McGuffeys knew how to keep a foot in each ant hill. They kept the synthetics: the attention to alphabet, the word lists divided into syllables with some diacritical markings to boot, and seemingly endless, complex rules for articulation and elocution. I recommend these sections to today's researchers on phonemic segmentation. It's potentially a dull topic but the McGuffeys tried to put some zip into it.

The rest of each McGuffey reader is analytic: whole stories and excerpts, some dull and preachy and some sensational in depicting vanity, sloth, and other sins excluding the X-rated ones; and some thinly written expository pieces. Those early McGuffey editions sold 121 million copies, enough to turn modern basal publishers sick with envy. They also established the concept of eclecticism--reading instruction that combines both synthetic and analytic elements, methods, and philosophies.

The rest of the history might be interpreted as swervings from one side of the eclectic road to the other. The story method, which is QUOTE NUMBER TWO on your handout, is from the Silver, Burdett readers. With just a couple of changes, it might be an outline for a plan to teach one of today's Big Books. The date is 1897.

QUOTE NUMBER THREE came earlier: it's from a report of a state school superintendent. It came out in 1880 and the state is Indiana, but I'd have sworn it's from Bill Honig, state superintendent of California, a hundred years later.

But this late 1890s period is also the time of the most elaborate phonetics
** instruction ever. Here is the publication of MISS POLLARDS SYNTHETIC METHOD (OVERHEAD #3) whose manual is excerpted in your QUOTE NUMBER FOUR. It appeared in 1889. And there are many other examples of elaborate phonetics: the Ward Readers, the Beacon Readers, the Gordon Readers, etc.

I won't go into detail about what happened. You can read it in Nila Banton Smith's remarkable history and other sources such as Alice McGuffey Ruggles' biography of the
*** McGuffey brothers. (OVERHEAD #4)

Some of you may say that this period exactly a century ago is where reading went wrong. That wasn't a ditch at the side of the eclectic road: it was a crossroads. We should have taken it. But which one? The analytic road to literature taught in basically holistic ways? Or synthetics, the carefully selected, orderly bits of Miss Pollard?

It wasn't to be. After World War I there's a revolt against literature, as QUOTE NUMBER FIVE, whose date is 1919, explains. And the revolt against phonics (still called <u>phonetics</u>) is just as firm, judging by the efforts of Guy T. Buswell et al. to teach synthetics <u>non</u>-orally. Actually, to teach phonetics without opening one's mouth strikes me as the winner in absurdity in reading methodology. I'd rather bake the letters out of gingerbread. However, after studying Nila Banton Smith's account of how ideas for teaching reading are born, die, and rise again, I shouldn't be surprised to see a future IRA Institute devoted to a Nonoral Nonliterature Method of Teaching Reading

The Smith history (the edition I'm describing) ends in 1934. It is the decade in which modern eclectic basal readers got their firm foothold--for example, the Elson Readers of William S. Gray, which were the forerunners of Dick and Jane; Arthur I. Gates' Macmillan series; Bobbs-Merrill; Silver, Burdett; D. C. Heath; American Book; Charles E. Merrill. Does that list sound familiar? In all, there were 16 basal

reading series on the market in the 1930s and they seemed to be everywhere, even in the most Depressed schools.

So Nila Banton Smith sat down and analyzed them--all 16 reading series on the market. Such an analysis today is likely to be spotty or single variable. One person looks for explicit comprehension instruction, another studies levels and types of questions, another looks for applied phonics, another examines balance between fiction and nonfiction. But Smith analyzed them all, including the manuals. Then she went out and did what today we'd call an ethnography of a first grade, a third grade, and a fifth grade to see how they used those basals and what else they were up to. Then she surveyed other classrooms to verify her findings.

The first question you may have is when on earth did she find time to work in her garden. She doesn't answer that one. But she is very clear about what she found in basals. She found them responding to just about every movement, analytic and synthetic, that had occurred over the past 50 years. They absorbed and combined. They were as dedicated as Siegfried at trying to hammer diverse pieces into an eclectic sword--or, as some have suggested, they were just eager to sell. But, whatever the basals were up to, Nila Banton Smith found something else beginning to happen in the classrooms she studied: experience charts and creative writing, attempts at what she carefully describes as correlated or integrated curricula emerging more often than not from children's expressed interests: whales, Switzerland, Indians, folklore. (See QUOTE NUMBER SIX) 1934 She found widespread use of what today we call trade books--whole book library materials. Although she speculated that these new movements might not reach all classrooms or even the majority of them, she recognized their challenge to the eclectic basals. She stated her conviction--I'm reading from page 266: "The basic set of readers [that is, the basals] eventually will disappear. It may continue to wield its power for fifteen years or for fifty years, but in time it will march silently out of the classroom and be relegated to dusty attics along with its progenitor, the hornbook."

Well, so much for the prophetic powers of Nila Banton Smith. It is 56 years since her prediction, and now it would seem that if basals march to the attic it's

to make room for newer basals. Flood and Lapp report that in the U. S. today basals are present in 98% of classrooms, while other studies report that in 75% of those classrooms the basal is the only material used for reading instruction.

Why? Why was Nila apparently mistaken? And shall we be sorry?

Those who have attempted to update history, including Smith herself, have sometimes described American reading instruction of the past 50 years as "guided by TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION." Such terms mask what really happened. They hide what ought to concern us today and in the future. Permit me to give a personal view.

I began teaching in the 1950s. At various times, I taught first grade, fourth grade, and sixth grade, using the Never-mind basal readers. Actually, we changed basals three times but the stories, although different, were the same. One day one of my fourth-graders noticed that one of the stories we liked was taken from a library book. There was actually a whole library book about Freddy the Pig. That was the school library. If you went downtown to the public library there in Salina, Kansas, in 1954, you could find eight books about Freddy the Pig. That was just great for the Pig group, but what became known as the Horse group rebelled. Fortunately, there was an excerpt from Marguerite Henry's KING OF THE WIND in another basal, so--voila!--we'd found another author to chase down in the library, this time an author for the Horse group.

About this time, I enrolled in summer school and took a course that turned out to be about Individualized Reading. I took a trip to the San Diego area and for the first time heard about the Language-Experience approach to teaching reading. I started reading articles about these alternatives to the basal in magazines such as INSTRUCTOR and ELEMENTARY ENGLISH. If you'd introduced me to Jeanette Veatch or Roach Van Allen in those days, I'd have fainted dead away the way people were fainting over the Beatles.

So in 1960 I set off for Stanford University to learn all about teaching reading. I was pretty sure that the answers lay in holistic approaches--that is, analytics such as Individualized Reading and Language-Experience. But I wasn't sure. Neither, as it turned out, was Stanford.

The behaviorists at Stanford were on the "quest for certainty" kick that John

Dewey had warned them about. You defined what it was you wanted to teach; you taught it; then you measured its outcomes. At Stanford I wrote a note at the end of a psych test: "Only that which can be measured/ Can be treasured." I was afraid the professor would be mad at me, but he wasn't: he wrote "Good thinking" beside my couplet.

What was the effect on reading instruction of this quest for certainty? Well, the broad outcomes of Individualized Reading and Language-Experience were too nebulous for the researchers. Instead, in the 1960s, attention went to decoding: reading programs were identified on the basis of how they taught decoding. There was decoding according to the structural linguists led by Bloomfield--the "Nan can fan Dan" school. There was decoding according to the phonics generalizations specialists--led, I'd say, by Clymer, Venezky, and Hanna. Much of the public approved. Some of them had believed all along that phonics and reading were synonymous.

I won't take time for more documentaiton of the decoding emphasis of the 1960s, though it wouldn't be hard. The basal reading people, in the meantime, must have been going nuts. In the 1950s they'd started boxing up whole trade books, making literature sampler kits, and publishing big writing guides for the analytics thrust. Now, suddenly, they were competing with the Sullivans and Lippincotts, some programmed instruction and some page by page decoding drill led by the teacher. Perhaps they began to long for a life of their own.

That wasn't to be--not in the Seventies, anyway, with skills management systems causing excitement. They had names like games: SARI, SCORE, SOBAR, PLAN, PRI, Fountain Valley, Wisconsin Design. They broke skills into subskills that even a cat could learn if only cats were more cooperative. The rules were simple too: practice a subskill to mastery, then move up the ladder to the next one. It still sounds so sensible that you wonder why the Greeks didn't think of it in the first place and save us 2500 years of confusion. Meanwhile, the basal readers divorced their workbooks from pupil books so that the worksheets could be used independently in anyone's skills management system. It can't be called the high point in eclecticism but it was the absolute limit in accommodation.

In 1979 Dolores Durkin studied what had happened. She found that teachers were busy assigning worksheets, assessing subskills, and not instructing. She seemed surprised.

Well, right after that, in the Eighties, subskills and skills found themselves in economy seating, and strategies got upgraded to first-class. After all, strategies are for teaching--they're things you can teach someone to do. In the Eighties and 1990 the most recommended way to teach them is by Direct Instruction. The teacher models, thinks aloud, monitors, and fades. The pupil activates, predicts, maps, CTAs, KWLs, VSSs, PIRLs, SQ3Rs, DIAs, self-monitors, and metacognizes. Somehow it doesn't yet sound like a cohesvie theory, I'm afraid. But each of those strategies, taught by Direct Instruction, seems to be supported by research, and it is this maze of strategies that comprises the comprehension chapters in most current reading methods textbooks.

It is also the capper on 30 years of synthetics in the teaching of reading. For this strategies-through-direct-instruction movement is a menu to be used to get the child to do what's good for him. Its philosophy is in the idealist tradition--a world from outside the learner. Its research base is that of the empiricist.

Now, there are people who think that what I've described is synonymous with progress. There are people who don't. So you shouldn't be surprised to find a group of analytics trying to pull things over to their side of the road. These Whole Language, literature-based, open classroom, etc., folk seem to be saying that real learning is opportunistic, emergent, necessarily based on what the learner perceives as need. They call for teachers who are ethnographers instead of menu-givers. Learning, they say, is transactional and the teacher and materials are there to assist the transaction. This, I think, is the message of the analytics.

What's going to happen? I haven't the slightest doubt. Someone will have breadth enough to blend those fragmented strategies into a cohesive theory and procedure. Those who support holistic, emergent learning will train teachers and, hopefully, researchers to include that side of things, just as the Reading Recovery movement seems to be doing right now. The eclectic vehicle will continue on its long road. Some people will say it's because we don't know any better, but some believe it's because, after all, well-forged eclecticism is the best way.

Notice, though, I don't say eclectic basal readers. Up till now, the basals seem to be the driver of the eclectic vehicle--some people call it the bandwagon--but there's no law that says eclectic means basal. It is up to the basals to stay in the driver's seat.

So now we've come to Batman's child. Here she is, ready or not to be taught to read. She unfurls her wings. Evolution has done her proud. It has given her power and control, not just of her body but the extensions of technology. It has also given her sinus and a weak lower back, but let's grant evolution a misstep or two. It has given Batman's child a language apparatus that astounds the linguistics professor; cognitive facility that only a cognitivist would dare to circumscribe; and the potential, not yet fully activated, to seek the good and beautiful.

This eclectic reading methodology which we'll bring to her is a product of evolution, too, as I've taken great pains to show. It includes things we've learned from memorization, the story approach, the unit method, Individualized Reading, and Whole Language. It includes vast improvements to phonics instruction from the Sixties, some positive use of management systems, and our accumulated regard for the venerable alphabet without which none of almost anything would be possible. Perhaps it all started, by the way, when a prehistoric ancestor of Dale Johnson pointed to a smudge on the cave wall and said, "That says the."

The question is, is it enough? As children say on a long car trip, "Are we there yet?" No. There's distance to go before Batman's child becomes the mature reader envisioned in that classic Gray and Rogers study you may have read. So, in the interests of getting there, here are my five suggestions.

First, the need for an Emergent Instruction model. Arthur Gates called it opportunistic instruction; it capitalized on the immediate interests and needs of the learner. Dewey called it experimentalism; he suggested steps in problem-solving to enable learners to explore and discover their own solutions. The modern Reading Recovery stretegist says that it begins with "roaming the known," exploring what the reader can do and wants to learn to do.

Emergent Instruction, contrasted with Direct Instruction, is difficult to script or pre-plan. It's hard to put it into an experimental design because you can't specify what you're going to do ahead of time. You don't start with a menu or an ITIP sequence of objectives. And it presents a challenge for the directive approach that has dominated basal reader manuals. I'm not arguing that it should displace Direct Instruction, but it should have equal billing. It is an alternative, a complement. The Emergent Instruction model recognizes that learning is a transaction, with the learner sharing in the transaction in a way that Direct Instruction does not.

Second, the centrality of the teacher needs to be recognized. Despite all I've said of the history of approaches, the swervings from one side of the road to the other, there have always been teachers who have taught in balanced, individualistic ways. Now more than ever, the teacher is the central figure in a child's education--the constant, stable adult on whom learning depends. I know one group of classroom observers who went out to study the effects of different reading materials. They came back to repor "In many classrooms the children love their teachers. They learn whatever material the teacher presents because of that love of teacher." The eclectic approach of the future must respect the centrality of teachers. It can't prescribe or script what they're to do and say.

Third, we need to re-think children's interests. Dianne Monson and I reviewed research on children's interests and discovered more than we wanted to know. Since 1897, there have been about 400 interest studies listing topics and titles by age and sex. They get repetitious and predictable. But recently they've stopped. Instead, we find ethnographies of how teachers and peer interaction arouse interest. Suddenly interest is a dynamic, and the school is a society in itself, where interests can be generated. The possibilities for using realia and technology to initiate, not just reflect, interests in school are enormous, not to be confined to what a child has seen on TV or in the neighborhood.

Fourth, while attention is strong, let's take a good look at what ought to be done and ought not to be done with children's literature. Louise Rosenblatt makes the basic distinction. We read literature first of all, she says, for aesthetic reasons--an evocation, a lived-through experience, a transaction. We read to respond. As Zarrillo and Cox point out, such response must include "the opportunity to create personal meanings." There is, in fact, a whole recent legacy of how to elicit such aesthetic response to literature, including the lore of literature circles and extensions. Unfortunately, many modern eclectics don't seem aware of this. The sudden interest in literature by comprehension experts doesn't also include a sudden interest in Rosenblatt's aesthetic theory or aesthetic techniques for eliciting response to literature. What we find, instead, is a use of literature which is predominantly efferent--utilitarian, reading to answer someone's questions or to retrieve the material for some future use. Rosenblatt illustrates the confusion between aesthetic and efferent with an example purportedly taken from a basal reader: "What facts do you learn about bugs as a result of reading this poem?"

The challenge to eclectics is to include aesthetic response-to-literature reading instruction. At the moment, this half is missing from basals and quite a few classrooms, as the recent study of Zarrillo and Cox has shown. The result is a condition called aliteracy: an aliterate is a person who can read but who does not choose to do so.

Fifth, let's consider anew the case for Functional Reading. What is it? Is it documents--the term now coming into vogue? Is it congruence between job-related reading and what is taught in reading class? For Batman's child, I wouldn't start with either. I'd start with the question of what is functional reading for a child? McDonald's wrappers, TV dinners, gum papers, Nintendo directions, signs such as NO TRESPASSING and STAY RIGHT that you can put up in the classroom. To get from Seattle to Atlanta I had to read 37 signs. Is there a way that children can become aware and involved with functional reading as I was in finding Gate C23 at O'Hare while also keeping a sharp eye out for MEN'S ROOM. How can we increase what children do with Functional Reading and incorporate this into eclectic methodology?

I realize that those 5 ideas do not add up to a new eclecticism. I'll leave that to younger, smarter people such as my colleagues Tim Standal, Sheila Valencia, and you. By the way, the metacognition experts would now praise me for knowing the limits of my archetectual system. More than once I've stopped to wonder if I'm here under false colors anyway. I'll tell you why. A decade or so ago Dale Johnson and I were on the same speaking circuit. No matter where we went, we ended up on the same program. At that time Dale was practicing on a more-or-less musical instrument called the kazoo. I've no idea whether he was good at it because I have no basis for comparison. All I know is that I'd be giving my speech and there would be Dale, sitting there fingering his kazoo. So when I came to a dull stretch in my speech, I'd stop and ask the audience, "How would you like to hear Dale Johnson play his kazoo?" Then there would be much applause and stamping of feet, and Dale would oblige. Now it has occurred to me that Dale doesn't really want me for a leader in reading at all. He's just put me up here in the hope that he'll get another chance to play his kazoo. . . .

I have one more thing to tell you, even though I'm beginning to sound like the nurse in "Romeo and Juliet," who, as they say, was afflicted with total recall. I want to take you back one more time--to 1965, a quarter of a century ago, to the IRA Convention in Detroit. It was the first one I attended. They had a Leaders in Reading series at that one, too, and the first speaker was Arthur I. Gates. He told his audience to tolerate disagreement: "The time to worry is not when we encounter changes and uncertainties but self-satisfied agreement among our experts. A state of agreement usually means merely that progress has come to a halt."

I thought of those words when I read the transcript of the five leaders who formed the panel on literacy at last year's convention in New Orleans. I noticed that, despite their apparent differences, four-fifths of them seemed to want to claim to be eclectic: they all wanted to sit in the middle. I wasn't there, but it's my impression that they all ended up sitting on Ira Aaron's lap.

In that same speech, a quarter of a century ago, Arthur I Gates gave a graceful bit of advice which needs saying again today as we go charging out to make Batman's child a wonderful literature. He said this:

> My long professional life has convinced me that, except for sheer intelligence, the greatest professional asset is a gay heart. The leaders in educational science I have known were extremely gay men and women. They were dedicated to their work, because they found it full of thrilling challenges. I now regard the deadly ever-serious scientist with some suspicion. He is almost sure to be a bore. When one of these persons has me cornered, my mind is likely to wing off to a sweet vision. It is the vision of my dog. When I get home I shall give him the signal that means, "Let's go for a walk in the woods." He will appear to go mad with joy. All over the place he will explode into geysers of gaiety. Is it not one of the wonders of the world that this beautiful, incredibly lively animal will seem to be filled with ecstasy at the prospect of taking a walk with me—with me, poor dull clod that I am, stumbling along at a snail's pace, insensitive to the thrills of forest smells and sounds that make him tingle with heavenly delight. Is this dog's rapture the outcome of a magic fountain of acquired gaiety or the culmination of inheritances of ages of sensitivity to the thrills of venturing into the realm of mystery? Both contribute, I think; each enlivens the other. And so I express the hope that all of you will discover the excitement of adventures in the hunting grounds which the profession and science of education provide.

Finally, let me pay tribute to three colleagues who have come and gone--mentors of all of us. It's difficult to believe or accept that when we attend an IRA Convention, we won't see them. Dorothy Kendall Bracken. Harry Singer. Ron Mitchell. They were true leaders in reading. This speech is dedicated to their memory.

IRA CONVENTION: ATLANTA: MAY 9, 1990 Sam Sebesta

LITERACY FOR BATMAN'S CHILD

QUOTE #1. In reading, the general practice has been to begin with the alphabet, and drill the child upon the letters, month after month, until he is supposed to have acquired them. This method, so irksome and vexatious to both teacher and scholar, is now giving place to another, which experience has proved to be more philosophical, intelligent, pleasant, and rapid. It is that of beginning with familiar and easy words, instead of letters.

QUOTE #2. METHOD OF TEACHING

I. Telling the story
II. Dramatization
III. Blackboard work
IV. Analysis
    1. Thought groups
    2. Sentences
    3. Words in groups
    4. Sight words
    5. Phonetics
V. Reading from the book

QUOTE #3. The public school teaches the child to read, but it does not teach him what to read or how to read. It gives him the ability to interpret the printed page, but it fails in a great measure to cultivate in him a taste for what is elevating and instructive. In view of the attractive garb in which vicious literature is clothed, he will be more likely to read to his injury than to his profit.

QUOTE #4. Make reading of the first importance. As in music, let there be scales to practice; drills in articulation; a thorough preparation for reading before the simplest sentence is attempted. Instead of teaching the word as a whole and afterward subjecting it to phonic analysis, is it not infinitely better to take the sounds of the letters for our starting point, and with these sounds lay a foundation firm and broad, upon which we can build whole families of words for instant recognition? There must be no guess work.

QUOTE #5. It appears at the present time that the pendulum which regulates methods of teaching reading has swung away from the elaborate and fanciful schemes of songs, stories, games, jingles, and dramatics, which for the past few years have encumbered reading procedures and obscured reading purposes. The aim of reading instruction which should now prevail is to develop ability in effective rapid silent reading.

QUOTE #6. The term "correlation" is used to designate the method in which reading is not thought of as the central core about which all these other activities should revolve, but rather as having a co-relation or equal relation with other subjects and activities. For example, if the children are reading a unit in their readers based on the Japanese, then in geography they study Japan, in arithmetic they work concrete problems about Japan, in spelling they spell words taken from their reading about Japan, in art they draw Japanese pictures, and so on. The various subjects and activities are drawn upon equally and are related by virtue of the fact that the textbook or teacher prescribes a unit of work in which it is desired to make use of the several different subjects. In such cases, the connections between reading and the other subjects and activities are often forced and unnatural.

When do you think each quote was written or spoken? By whom?

Quote 1. _____ Quote 4. _____

Quote 2. _____ Quote 5. _____

Quote 3. _____ Quote 6. _____